

REMARKS

Claim 2 has been canceled. Claims 1, 3, 4, 9, and 16 have been amended to clarify the subject matter regarded as the invention. Claims 1 and 3-20 are pending.

The specification has been amended in a manner believed to overcome the objections to the specification.

Claim 1 has been amended in a manner believed to overcome the rejection under 35 USC 112, second paragraph. Specifically, the claim has been amended to make clear the antecedent basis of the recited “computer program” is in the preamble.

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-20 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Raith.

The rejection is respectfully traversed. With respect to claim 1, Raith describes using a flag in a mobile telecommunications network to let a mobile station (e.g., cell phone) know that a key called the “B-key” needs to be reset (i.e., resynchronized with the network). Claim 1 as amended recites “a prescribed level of privilege is required to start the process such that a user having the prescribed level of privilege but not the key can without intervention of a provider with which the computer program is associated cause the key to be reset to the default value.” As taught by Raith, the mobile telecommunications provider initiates and participates in the resetting of the B-key, which must be synchronized between the mobile station and the network. As such, the resetting of the B-key as taught by Raith is not effected “without intervention of a provider” as recited in claim 1. Therefore, claim 1 is believed to be allowable.

Claims 3-8 depend from claim 1 and are believed to be allowable for the same reasons described above.

Claims 9 and 16 have been amended in the same manner as claim 1 and are believed to be allowable for the same reasons described above. Claim 10-15 depend from claim 9 and are believed to be allowable for the same reasons described above. Likewise, claims 17-20 depend from claim 16 and are believed to be allowable for the same reasons described above.

The foregoing amendments are not to be taken as an admission of unpatentability of any of the claims prior to the amendments.

Reconsideration of the application and allowance of all claims are respectfully requested based on the preceding remarks. If at any time the Examiner believes that an interview would be helpful, please contact the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 10/1/2007

William J. James
William J. James
Registration No. 40,661
V 408-973-2592
F 408-973-2595

VAN PELT, YI & JAMES LLP
10050 N. Foothill Blvd., Suite 200
Cupertino, CA 95014